651
8 J5
py 1

The Transylvania Problem

By

John Jivi-Banatanu
Editor of "America"
Roumanian Daily

CLEVELAND, O.

Published and Distributed by Roumanian National League of America
5705 Detroit Ave.
1920

The Transylvania Problem

By

John Jivi-Banatanu
Editor of "America"
Roumanian Daily

CLEVELAND, O.

Published and Distributed by Roumanian
National League of America
5705 Detroit Ave.
1920

D651
.T8J5

FOREWORD!

At time of going to press, the newspaper carry dispatches saying Hungarians from all parts of the United States are to assemble in Washington during the week of April 4 to urge President Wilson and members of Congress to support the protests of Hungary against "the giving of territory to new states created on the ruins of the Austro-Hungarian Empire."

This movement is in keeping with the established Hungarian policies of propaganda. Roumanians in the United States and their kindred of Roumanian descent do not feel it necessary to go to Washington personally to contradict the claims which will be set forth by the Hungarians.

So well established are the claims of Roumania to Transylvania that Roumanians everywhere are willing to stand on their case as established by historical and ethnological fact. If a plebescite is held in Transylvania, it will be welcomed by all Roumanians, for it can have only one result: a greater Roumania.

Transylvania is Roumanian in body and spirit.

Gift
Author
JUL 29 1920

The Transylvania Problem

I.

THE ISSUES DEFINED

Just what is the problem of Transylvania? Just what are the claims of Roumania upon this rich province, so long almost forgotten by the world, except as a part of the Kingdom of Hungary and the empire of the Hapsburgs?

Did not the Roumanians seize Transylvania by force, after the armistice, and contrary to the wishes of the Allied Council in Paris? Are they not seeking thus by force to make this war not a war of principles but a war of conquest?

In the United States, where so little of the truth about Roumania has been known by the people, such questions are common enough. It is the purpose of this booklet to tell Americans the truth about the problem of Transylvania.

A ROUMANIA IRREDENTA.

Transylvania is the Roumania Irredenta, the Roumanian Alsace-Lorraine. Its people, des-

spite oppression, always have been Roumanian. In the beginning it was, and in the future it must be a part of Roumania.

If anything, it is more to the Roumanians as a nation than the Italia Irredenta to the Italians, than Alsace-Lorraine to the French. It is more than a lost province. The mountains of Transylvania were the birthplace of the Roumanian nation.

It was in the Carpathians that the race of Dacians had its origin, a race which even in its earliest days had a civilization, which was one of the first to abandon the killing of captives in warfare and other savage practices.

Under the emperor Trajan, Rome extended her sway over the lands of the Dacians, but the Dacians were never so much conquered as combined with the Latin invaders. The Roumanian race and the Roumanian language are the offspring of this union.

But throughout the world and particularly in the United States little has been heard except the noisy but hypocritical propaganda of the Hungarians. For centuries the Hungarians have played the wolf at home and the lamb abroad.

Before disaster felled the Central Empires, Hungary stood over her subject peoples and her small neighbors with the heavy rods of force and terror, compelling silence. Abroad she

crept into the presence of the world as the victim and slave of rapacious Austria.

Today Hungary stands before the world singing a pathetic song about her woes and losses. Her latest plea is that the Roumanians have seized Transylvania. And Hungary now claims Transylvania by right of long occupation as a homeland, despite history, despite a census which reveals that Transylvania today is still overwhelmingly Roumanian.

IF AMERICA SUFFERED.

Let me bring the situation a little nearer home to the American people so they may understand the feelings of the Roumanians regarding Transylvania.

Suppose the Germans or the Japanese or the Hottentots or any other race were to swarm down upon the Atlantic seaboard of the United States and occupy by force the thirteen states which were the original colonies.

Suppose after centuries of armed oppression they were to advance the claim that they, and not the New Englanders, the New Yorkers, the Pennsylvanians, the Virginians and the Georgians, were the original settlers.

Suppose the invaders were to advance the theory that the Americans in the occupied territory had come there by migration from the plains of the Middle West, moving eastward through the Appalachian mountains.

Impossible! Unthinkable! Yet this is just the sort of claim advanced by Hungary in her plea to retain Transylvania. This, for Americans, hypothetical tragedy has been the tragedy of the Roumanians for centuries.

In the face of history, despite all reason and justice, Hungary would tell the world that the Roumanians who predominate in Transylvania were immigrants who came by migration from the east. Even the names of the towns and rivers of the province, the name of Transylvania itself give the lie to this argument.

ROUMANIAN HOMELAND.

The mountains of Transylvania are as truly the birthplace of the Roumanian nation as the thirteen colonies were the birthplace of the American nation. Transylvania is as truly Roumanian as New York or Massachusetts or Virginia are American. Consider this and you will begin to understand the aspirations of the Roumanian people.

"But," say the subtle Magyar propagandists, "the Roumanians did not await the dictates of the Peace Conference. They threw their armies as far as Budapest. It was force they used to wrest Transylvania from us. Plunder and conquests were the objects of their invasion."

To this argument the answer is simple. In 1919, when Roumania moved against Hungary, the Bolshevist rule of Bela Kun was men-

acing not only Roumania but all of Europe. The diplomats at Paris faltered. The Roumanians did not. They acted. They destroyed the red menace to all Central Europe.

And when Bela Kun had been overthrown, the Roumanians retired peacefully, to the borders of Transylvania, which they held, rightfully, as their own, but not by right of conquest, but by right of heritage and history.

The Transylvanians themselves joined voluntarily with the Roumanians and today exercise large authority and power in the government of the whole kingdom.

Compare the Roumanian invasion of Bolshevik Hungary with the earlier invasion of Roumania by the Central Powers, Hungary among the foremost. Where the armies of the Central Powers had spread terror and suffering the Roumanian armies restored law and order. Roumania had been looted and ravaged. Hungary felt only the strong hand of a just and compelling police power.

The world owes a debt to Roumania for what she did, both during the war and after; and the world must not be deceived by the piteous cries of those who only a short time ago were openly the world's enemies.

But Roumania is not asking for mere rewards and favors. She is asking only for justice. Her national aspirations are not born of victory. They are the aspirations of a thousand

years of existence. Roumania asks for Transylvania; holds Transylvania simply because it always has been and always will be Roumanian, and is part and parcel of Roumanian national existence.

America can and will do much to strengthen the cause of Roumania when the truth is known everywhere, for in the facts of history itself are found arguments which appeal to the American sense of justice and fair play.

II.

IMPARTIAL FACTS TALK

Transylvania is a high plateau walled in on all sides by an irregular circle of mountains. On the east and south are the high peaks of the Carpathians. Running down from the north is a spur of lower ranges which form the west wall of the country.

It is as though the mountains themselves had opened out and formed this rich state over which they stand sentinel. It is a rolling country with a mean altitude of 1,000 to 1,600 feet above sea level. It is rich in fields and forests and mineral resources. The mountains feed its many rivers.

THE ORIGINAL ROUMANIA.

In the days before the Romans came, the Dacians had their homes in the lofty mountains to the east and south of Transylvania, and from

them they roamed at will both east and west. Their realm comprised both Transylvania and what is now Roumania proper.

The Romans under Trajan in the Second Century secured control of this kingdom, but they kept its boundaries intact. They planted Roman colonies not to exterminate the Dacians but to mingle with them and build a barrier state against the barbarian hordes to the north.

Thus the Roumanian nation was established in the two great plains east and west of the Carpathians, with its point of origin firmly established in those mountains. When the Roman empire receded the Roumanian nation was left behind, a new race, a composite of Romans and Dacians.

It was a race which had inherited laws and a deep respect for law and order from their ancestors. Under its native princes it flourished. And in particular, the fame of Dacia Felix, as Transylvania was then known, spread abroad.

THE HUNGARIAN SWEEPS IN.

It was this richness of the country which attracted the roving Hungarians under Arpad in 890-898 and later their cousins, the Huns; and sweeping in through the low mountains to the west, as Anonymus Belae Notarius tells us in the Fourteenth Century, they laid the country waste and brought it under subjection.

In Transylvania, Prince Gelu; in Maramur-

esh, Prince Menu-Morot; in Crishana and Banat, Prince Claudiu, fell under the invader. Moravia and Panonia were subdued also.

Anonymus Belae Notarius tells us that for a time after the invasion a compact of peace endured between the Roumanians and the Hungarians. But it was impossible for this to continue.

Two more different races could not have been brought together. The Roumanians, peace loving and law-abiding, industrious and cultured. The Huns, a race of Nomads, seeking only to profit by the industry of other peoples. A mingling of the races, as when the Romans met the Dacians, was out of the question.

Rapidly the Hungarians drew away from their agreement and instead of working with the Roumanians imposed a tyranny of force and oppression, a tyranny against which the Roumanians rebelled again and again but which lasted until Hungary fell.

HIS APOLOGISTS REFUTED.

Hungarian apologists have tried to justify this oppression, the effort to exterminate the Roumanians in Transylvania with the theory that the Roumanians there were not there in the beginning, but came by invasion and migration from east to west.

In 1886 Hunfalvy, (alias Hunsdorfer) and Rethy, two Hungarians, with the aid of

Robert Roessler, endeavored to prove a claim that the Hungarians were the original inhabitants of the province. But Lavisse, Gibbon, Ranke, and other authorites on the subject have offered this refutation:

1. The Carpathian mountains have easy passes on the west whence the Huns came, whereas on the east they are high and difficult, making a huge natural fortress, so that a Roumanian invasion from the east in the early days with the poor transportation and facilities for warfare seems more than an impossibility.

2. The names of rivers, towns, localities to this day show the existence there prior to the coming of the Huns of the Latin civilization, for the existence of such names in Hungarian territory is not explainable otherwise.

AUTHORITIES SPEAK.

Says Mr. R. H. Seton-Watson, B. Litt. (The Rise of Nationality in the Balkans, p. 58):

"A purely academic question has been distorted to serve the purpose of rival parties and to prove or disprove claims of racial supremacy. Certain points cannot and never will be cleared up for lack of evidence, it is true.

"But the main lines are absolutely clear and no amount of political special pleading can succeed in distorting them. The modern Roumanians are the descendants of the Roman

colonists whom Trajan planted for the defence of the empire against the northern barbarians.

"Perhaps the best proof that the Roumanian tide did not set from south to north and from east to west, as the Magyar apologists argue, but from north to south and from west to east, is supplied by the position of the various capitals.

"In Wallachia, the original centers were Cimpulung and Curtea de Arges, which were superseded first by Tirgovistea and finally by Bucuresti; while in Moldavia, the capital was transferred from its original seat in Suceava to Jassy. In each case it was a gradual descent from the northern and western mountains to the plains of the Danubian system."

The great Slavist F. Miklositsch is another who refutes the belated claims of the Hungarian propagandists:

"The origin of the Roumanian language," he says, "dates to the Second Century and the Roman colonies thrown across the Danube."

And Prof. J. Jung declares:

"The origin of the Roumanians is found in the continuation of the Romans planted by Trajan in Dacia."

T. Tamm, V. Duruy and other authorities support this fact; and we find evidence even in as early source as the "History of the Mongols", written by the Persian chronicler, Rashid Al-Din.

There is, however, a fourth, and most powerful argument which refutes the Hungarian claims to Transylvania as a homeland. It is the Roumanian majority in the population of Transylvania today, a majority which has existed since the beginning, defied extermination, and stands as a tribute to the virility of the Roumanian race.

In 1900, the "Ungariches Statistisches Jahrbuch, Bd. IX" gave the following figures on the national origins of the people in all Hungary, exclusive of Croatia-Slavonia:

*Magyar.....	8,588,834	
Non-Magyars....	8,132,740	divided as follows:
German.....	1,980,423	
Slovak.....	1,991,402	
Roumanian....	2,784,726	
Ruthenian.....	423,159	
Croat.....	188,552	
Serbian.....	434,641	
Minor races....	329,837	

*There were 851,378 Jews classified as Magyars.

So much for the general population survey of all Hungary in 1900. Now look at population distribution in Transylvania itself as shown by the Hungarian official figures in 1910. In ten counties, it will be seen, the Roumanians have a crushing majority. The following table is Hungarian:

County	Roumanian	Hungarian	Per cent Roumanian of all nationalities
Fogaras	84,436	3,263	90.2
Also-Feher	171,483	7,269	78.8
Hunyad	271,765	52,720	84.7
Szolnok-Doboka	189,483	52,181	76.3
Torda-Aranyos	125,668	44,630	72.9
Bestercze-Naszod	87,564	10,737	69.2
Szeben	113,672	10,159	66.9
Kolozs	161,127	111,439	68.6
Arad	239,755	124,215	65.0

In eight other counties the Roumanians were found to form from 30 to 60 per cent of the total population, in nearly every case outnumbering the Hungarians.

Kis-Kukullo	55,585	34,902	50.8
Nagy-Kukullo	60,881	18,474	42.7
Maros-Turda	71,009	134,166*	36.8
Brasso	35,091	35,372	35.7
Szhilagy	136,087	87,312	60.6
Bihar	265,098	365,642	44.8
Maramaros	84,510	52,964	36.8
Szatmar	119,760	268,385	34.6

These are all Hungarian figures. The Roumanian preponderance in Transylvania is even more apparent when we consider the manner in which Hungarian figures were obtained.

DISCOUNTING HUN FIGURES.

In the eighteen counties are nearly 1,000,000 Magyars; but if we deduct the Magyar majorities here and there which were maintained by

processes of Gerrymandering for political purposes; if we deduct the parts of those counties through which the Magyar Roumanian ethnical frontier passes, the Magyar minority in Roumanian territory is as low as 1 to 9.

Also, in order to arrive at something like true figures, the Hungarian official population in the occupied territory should be discounted. Washington during the war offered an example of how officialdom could pack a city.

But the Roumanians in Transylvania had many Washingtons. Their whole territorial structure was encrusted with Hungarian officials, enumerated with the rest of the population by the Hungarian census takers. If we deduct for this super-cargo of officialdom the Hungarian ratio falls from 1 to 9 to 1 to 15 for the Roumanians.

Again, the Hungarian census figures were "stuffed" with "Magyars de contrabande," even according to Karl Klette, writing in the "Ungarische Revue," Budapest.

"Usually," he says of the census takers, "they do not ask a man his nationality but if he speaks Hungarian. If he says 'Yes' he is put down as a Hungarian." Another ruse was to put down infants and helpless people as Hungarians, regardless of their national origin.

RELIGION TELLS TALE.

Foreign writers, aware of the trickery in Hungarian statistics, however, have based their estimates of the Roumanian population in Hungary on religious figures, rather than on the figures of the Budapesth government.

Where the Hungarians say there were only 2,784,726 Roumanians in all Hungary in 1900 and only 2,948,000 in 1916, these writers estimate the Roumanian population at 3,600,000 to 3,700,000. In "Rumanien," by Dr. Otto Freiher von Dungen, 1916, p. 31, is found an example of this correction of the Hungarian figures on population.

There can be no doubt that Transylvania is ethnically and always has been ethnically Roumanian.

Thus the Hungarian apologists are completely discredited and the Roumanian claims are seen to rest upon three proven facts:

1. That Transylvania is geographically Roumanian.

2. That Transylvania is historically Roumanian.

3. That Transylvania, despite centuries of Hungarian misrule, has maintained its Roumainian identity in population and is still ethnically Roumanian.

III.

TRANSYLVANIAN HISTORY

Here the case of Roumania for holding Transylvania by occupation might rest were it not necessary for self-protection at the present time to reveal in detail the tragic history of the province and the duplicity and treachery which has always characterized Hungarian rule.

For Hungary stands before the world today, still making her false pleas and special claims for favor; and the Roumanians feel they will be secure in what they have regained only if they put their whole story plainly and truthfully before the jury of the nations.

In 1526, after the defeat of the Hungarians at the battle of Mohacs, the Transylvanians emerged as an independent state for the first time since they were submerged in the original Hun invasion.

HAPSBURG TREACHERY.

On Oct. 28, 1599, Mihaiu the Brave entered Transylvania with his vision of a united Roumanian kingdom, but it lasted only a moment. On Aug. 9, 1601, Mihaiu the Brave was assassinated by Hapsburg plotters, who then took the province back into their own hands.

For nearly a century, until 1691, the Hapsburgs allowed the Transylvanians some degree of autonomy; but there followed a military occu-

pation which was worse than any which had gone before.

The Hapsburgs then reached an agreement with the Hungarian nobles, by which the province of Transylvania and the power over its Roumanian inhabitants was placed in the keeping of the Hungarian aristocracy.

Massacres, horrors and persecutions inflicted on the luckless Roumanians in Transylvania led in 1784 to a revolution, which was put down only when the Roumanian leaders, Horia, Closca, and Crisan were put to death without trial.

In the reflex of the French Revolution which happened soon after, the tyrants thought it best to lighten somewhat the burdens of the Roumanian subjects, but this was only a respite. Soon again the Hungarian oppression was as severe as before.

A PAWN IN POLITICS.

So it went. Transylvania was used by the Hapsburgs as a pawn in their own private little game with the Hungarian nobility. In 1867, Transylvania was definitely and finally annexed to Hungary, the Austrians playing the part of Judas and the Hungarians the part of the hangmen in the tragedy.

Protests of the Roumanian population of the province went for naught, for the oppressors

were not reckoning on the lasting moral force of the rebellion so easily crushed under foot in 1784. That one incident (it was scarcely more than that on the surface) had taught the Roumanians in Transylvania this important lesson—solidarity.

In 1867, at the final annexation, a delegation of 110 Roumanians from the government of Transylvania found their appeal to the Hapsburgs in vain; but they represented what the short-sighted Austrians and Hungarians could not see, a nation united against a tyrant.

IV.

HUNGARIAN POLICIES

We have seen how the Roumanian inhabitants of Transylvania were bartered away time and time again into the hands of the Hungarians. It is fitting now to examine the characteristics of these masters of the province. For Hungary has always posed before the world as a martyred nation, the Hungarians as the ardent exponents of liberty; and since their revolution in 1848 they have urged this belief by a deliberate system of propaganda.

The Hungarians a peace-loving people? Ask the Roumanians, the Slovaks, the Serbs, the Croats and the other nationalities who have been so unfortunate as to come under the Hungarian lash. See how their disguise is removed by the great Norwegian author, Bjornstjerne Bjornson:

TYRANTS AT HOME.

"The Magyars are most zealous when it pertains to the work of peace abroad. Generally they are the most zealous when it concerns humanity and legal consciousness. But at home, among themselves, they are oppressing millions of non-Magyars.

"They are prohibiting them from speaking the language of their soul. They are vilifying their love for their historic traditions. They are closing their museums and confiscating every means by which they might remain in communion with the life of their forefathers.

"In their parliament they insult them by calling them 'swine.' They throw them down the stairways. They spit at them in the newspapers. The man who in his office of chief minister of education is directing this vilification (he is now head of the Hungarian delegation at Paris) is simultaneously a champion of Christianity. His name is Count Apponyi. At all peace conferences, of all those present he does the most talking about peace". (Marz and Le Courier European, Sept. 17, 1907).

And Mr. Seton-Watson, in the preface of his "Racial Problems in Hungary", tells the same truth:

"A writer who challenges the long-established belief in Hungarian liberty and tolerance must be prepared to meet a charge of prejudice and bias," he says. Hungarian propaganda has worked remarkably well for years; it is a game of which they are masters.

KOSSUTH REVEALED.

Louis Kossuth had been held up to the world as the Hungarian champion of liberty. He was, for the Hungarians. But consider him as he was at home in his policies to all the subject non-Magyars. He was the leader among Hungarian chauvinists, he instituted the terrorization system of the non-Magyars, he was the father of Hungarian barbaric methods of Magyarization.

Magyarization of the non-Magyars in Hungary began in 1825 with the calling of the first National Assembly after the period of absolutism. First came Count Szecheny with his theory of latent Magyarization of all non-Magyars, a policy by which he hoped subtly to steal the life breath of the subject nationalities and so avoid resistance among them, a policy of slow-death for all non-Magyars.

But this gradual policy of Szecheny was too slow for the ardent Kossuth. "Pestri Hirlap", the Hungarian newspaper edited by him in 1841, reveals him as the prime advocate of forced Magyarization and a tyrant of the worst type towards all those non-Magyars. He denied the rights of all subject people to call themselves anything except Hungarian. In parliament, he upheld the doctrine that national and lingual unity is more precious than liberty, because liberty may be lost and regained but national unity never. This, only for Magyars, because the same right he denied to the non-Magyars.

Where Szecheny had been content merely to Magyarize the administration of the government, Kossuth insisted on the Magyarization of

schools, churches and all other institutions. In parliament he was instrumental in getting enacted laws designed to crush the subordinate nationalities. He even went so far at one time as to profess ignorance of the whereabouts of Croatia.

A RULE OF SPITE.

Many of the radical pan-Magyar laws were repealed by the Austrians, who in turn feared solidarity in Hungary; but the Hungarians, instead of softening their rule over the subject nationalities, made it a rule of still more spiteful severity.

As a result, when the Hungarian revolution against Austria broke out in 1848, the Hungarians found themselves with a revolution of their own on their hands. Not only the Roumanians in Transylvania, but the Serbs and the Slovaks in Hungarian provinces turned against their masters. The Roumanians had met May 16, 1848, on Liberty Field, near Blaj, and decided to free Transylvania from Hungary and fight for liberty. The Slovaks, at Lipto-Szt-Miklos took similar action.

On May 18, 1848, the Serbs after electing Col. Suplicat their leader issued a proclamation declaring their right to live as a nationality, preserving their own language, dress and customs.

Race war followed. The Russians intervening put Hungary back under Austrian rule for a time, and the Roumanians enjoyed a brief phase of liberty.

THE FINAL TREACHERY.

Finally, however, after the Austrian defeat at Konnigratz in 1867, Hungary gained independence. Then the dual monarchy was formed, and the Transylvanians found themselves lashed tightly to Hungary, tricked again by the larger powers. Where they had at times had at least the form of an autonomous principality, they now found themselves part and parcel of the Hungarian estate.

What then is the Magyar notion of liberty that has been so advertised in all the world? It was expressed by Kossuth himself in these words: "What is not Magyar is wrong. It should be Magyar. And what will not be Magyar will no longer be allowed to be." Could the Kaiser himself have voiced so well the spirit of a vicious imperialism?

V.

HUNGARY AND AUSTRIA

So much for the attitude of the Hungarians toward their subject peoples. In passing let us examine more closely the Hungarian complaints that they have been only the instruments of Austria. It appears to be simply a case of "passing the buck."

In the dual monarchy, Hungary enjoyed far more independence than was commonly supposed. Not only did Hungary have its own

parliament and its own internal government, but it virtually dominated the foreign office of the empire instead of playing only a minor part there as was commonly supposed.

Austria was in reality terrorized by the imperialistic hegemony of Hungary. The Vienna government was autocratic and bad, but it was far less vicious than the oligarchic government at Budapest.

HUNGARY DOMINANT.

To understand how Hungary in fact dominated the foreign policies of the Empire, one has only to read the list of representatives of the Austro-Hungarian government at the principal capitals.

The imperial chancellor when the war broke out was Count Berchtold, a Hungarian; his successor was Count Burian, a Hungarian; the ambassador at Paris was Count Szecheny, a Hungarian; at Petrograd, Count Szapary, a Hungarian; at Rome, Count Merey, a Hungarian; at Belgrade, Count Forgach, a Hungarian, and later Baron Giesel, a Hungarian.

It has only been through persistent and effective propaganda that the Hungarians have been able to conceal so long their really tremendous responsibility for the mismanagement of the dual monarchy and responsibility for this world war. If Austria, strong and powerful, was unable to reveal the state of things, how much more helpless were the Roumanians in Transylvania to direct the attention of the world to their plight.

VI.

SOME OF THE CRUELTIES

To catalogue all the crimes of the Hungarians against their subject nationalities, and particularly the Roumanians, would require a book. All their crimes could not be catalogued, so complete and ruthless in some cases was their work of destruction. But it will require only a few instances chosen here and there to show how systematic and persistent was the Hungarian persecution.

To begin with. There were 8,000,000 Hungarians or Magyars and 12,000,000 non-Magyars in Hungary before the crash of the empire. There were 420 seats in the Hungarian parliament, but all except eight of these seats were held by Magyar representatives, leaving the great non-Magyar population practically voiceless.

SCHOOLS SUPPRESSED.

Schools next felt the rough hand of Hungarian domination, despite a law passed in 1868 by which all non-Magyar schools were supposed to be supported by the government in proportion to the numerical strength of the respective nationalities. But the 3,000 Roumanian schools were left entirely to the Roumanians for support. Worse still, in 1907, at the instance of the merciless Count Apponyi, a policy of suppression was directed against the Roumanian institutions, and by 1912, more than 600 had been compelled to close their doors.

The Hungarians were particularly jealous of the efforts of the Roumanian population to undertake anything like higher education. In 1882, Gen. Trajan Doda was refused permission to open a Roumanian Lyceum at Caransebes. In 1885, a permit for a Lyceum at Arad was denied.

In 1889, the Roumanian Lyceum at Beuse, founded in 1826 by a Roumanian, and for many years tolerated, was closed by order of the Hungarian administration.

And even when, with their own schools and colleges closed, the Roumanians tried to get an education in the Hungarian institutions, they found the way closed to them. The Hungarians reviled them, called them names, spat upon them, and used every means possible to drive them back into a condition of ignorance and poverty, where the Hungarians felt it would be advantageous to keep them.

SOCIETIES FORBIDDEN.

Cultural, professional and agricultural societies also came under the ban of the Hungarians, if they happened to be Roumanian. In September 1881, the Roumanians at Sibiu were refused a permit to organize an agricultural society. On July 27, 1885, the Roumanian cultural society "Opinica Romana" was disbanded by order of the Hungarians. On Feb. 4, 1890, the Hungarians forbade the Roumanian students at Cluj University to organize. On Nov. 29, 1890, the Roumanian cultural society

"Progressul" at Arad was broken up. On Dec. 6, 1890, the Roumanian women at Cluj were denied the right to form a Women's Association, just as a few years before on April 7, 1886, the Roumanian women at Satmar had been denied the privilege of meetings.

"Our nationalities must not substitute any other culture for the Magyar, for there cannot be a special Serb, Roumanian or Slovak culture."

So wrote Baloghy Erno, a Hungarian chauvinist, in his book, "Magyar Culture and the Nationalities," (Budapesth 1908, see p. 210). And the Hungarians lived up to this doctrine, as brutally as they knew how. This was not any idea similar to that of the Americanization movement in the United States, where a government is dealing with people who have come under its jurisdiction voluntarily. The Hungarians were dealing with people who had been in the land long before they came there, who were not bound by any obligation to give up their heritage of culture or language, who had on the contrary every right to preserve their individuality; *living as they were within their ethnical boundaries.*

BLOODY CRUELTIES.

And the bloody cruelties! Yes, bloody! For no people, not even the Armenians, have suffered more from the Turks than the Roumanians and the other nationals who came under Hungarian rule. It was only a more subtle form of massacre and condemnation, with a mock ritual of justice and trial by legal

processes. And the cries of the victims were smothered under the wails of the Hungarian propagandists.

Between 1886 and 1908 no fewer than 577 Roumanians were sentenced to imprisonment for 128 years, nine months and twenty three days for so-called political offences. There was the Merisel massacre, in which a score were killed, and as many more injured for life and a whole district subjected to a reign of terror. And the massacres at Cornereava, Sepreus, Aleshd, Cehul-Silvanei, Corni, Baiâ Mare, Dobra, Panade and many others—a terrible list of crimes.

In the period just before Roumania entered the world war no less than 2,500 Roumanian priests and leaders in Hungary, particularly Transylvania, were arrested and condemned to death or imprisonment. This figure is taken from the Hungarian newspaper, "Pester Lloyd." How many escaped death can be deduced from this fact: Miss Mariora Puia, a Roumanian girl was put to death in October, 1915, only for the small offence of copying a Roumanian national song.

VII.

FROM WORLD VIEWPOINT

So much for the history of Hungarian brutality toward the Roumanians. It should not be necessary to say anything further to explain why Roumania entered the war, came in at a time when the fight seemed almost hopeless,

when aid from her Allies was almost a physical impossibility. For Roumania, certainly, it was no war of conquest but a war for right from the beginning. Roumania gave more than 13 per cent of her population to the armies she sent out to fight the foes of the world—a greater sacrifice than that of any other nation. She endured a devastating invasion; and still at the end of the war she was able to rise and strike down the Red Menace in Hungary.

EDITORIAL OPINIONS.

Although many in the United States have been deceived by the propaganda of the Hungarian apologists, the most enlightened and intelligent opinion has been quick to see the justice and necessity of the Roumanian claims.

The New York Times, March 5, 1920, says editorially:

HUNGARY'S TURN.

Now that the French have lightened the burden laid on Turkey and the British are interceding for easier terms to Germany, it is only fair that the Italians should take their turn by demanding concessions to Hungary. The question of Hungarian frontiers is before the Supreme Council, and the Italian representatives want to revise the frontiers of Jugoslavia, Rumania and the Czecho-slovak Republic in favor of the Magyars. Perhaps this does not mean as much trouble as the recent concessions to the Turks, but it will make conditions in Central Europe even worse than they are at present if the Italian proposal, to which the British representatives give approval, is carried out over French protests.

Hungary has been an applicant for special favors ever since the war ended. For a while the Magyars asked these favors without troubling to give any reason why they should be preferred over other hostile nations; but when they found the Peace Conference cold to the theory that the Magyars had an indestructible right to keep their old frontiers and their ten million unwilling subjects new tactics were tried. The Magyars threatened to bring in the Bolsheviki unless the Conference yielded. The Conference did

not yield and Hungary went Bolshevist. BELA KUN'S rule was not only a curse to Hungary, but a danger to all Central Europe, where his agents did their best to provoke or assist Bolshevist intrigue against existing Governments.

That rule was finally ended by the Rumanians, who were the most directly threatened. There was actual war between their troops and KUN'S Red armies, and the Rumanians eventually wearied of the theory of the Peace Conference that in this war the Magyars should do all the fighting. The Rumanians put BELA KUN out, and have ever since been beset by a campaign of calumny, in which sympathizers with Bolshevism have joined forces. Thanks to this misrepresentation the allied Governments have turned their faces against Rumania, which did them a great service when they were unable or afraid to do it, and have showed favors to Hungary, which has been persistently hostile.

When the Rumanians left Budapest the Magyar reactionaries came in. Their reign of terror has been worse than that of the Bolsheviki; and it has been directed by no means wholly against Bolsheviki, but equally against the Magyar liberals who, if they ever became strong enough, would make their country a good neighbor and a trustworthy member of the Central European society of nations. Admiral HORTHY, the Regent, is frankly merely a seat-warmer for some Hapsburg—if not for the former King CHARLES, or a member of the same family who will continue the same tradition. To all the democratic peoples, republican or monarchical, in that part of Europe the reactionary Government of Hungary is a standing danger.

The Magyars insist on modification of the frontiers. Lately they have put their claim on economic grounds—it has finally been made plain to them that the Supreme Council will not recognize their inherent right to rule their neighbors, but they say they must reannex the lost territories to rebuild the economic life of Hungary. Here is a confusion between politics and business. If the Magyars behave themselves, they will find that trade can cross frontier lines; if they do not behave, it is hard to see why the economic restoration of Hungary should be regarded as of more importance than the economic prosperity of her neighbors. Why should we reward those who fought against us merely because they demand it, and punish those who fought for us merely because they did us a service?

And the Cleveland Plain Dealer, on March 12, 1920, thus exposes the falsity of the Hungarian claims and the justice of the Roumanian position:

ROUMANIAN METHODS.

Of the allies Roumania was perhaps most urgently in need of immediate aid. The Germans and the allies had occupied all but a

small corner of Roumania, and when they retreated they swept the country bare. Everything takable was taken. The Hungarians, next door neighbors to the Roumanians, were probably the largest beneficiaries. To begin the work of rehabilitation Roumania needed the things that the Hungarians had stolen. The Roumanians watched the progress of events at Paris, and decided that the only way to recover their stolen property or its equivalent was to go into Hungary and get it.

This they did. It necessitated defiance of the mandates of the Paris conferees, but the Roumanian leaders believed that the justice as well as the practical common sense of their project warranted ignoring the dictum of the long-distance economists at Paris. Moerover, an outlaw communist "government" was rapidly ruining Hungary. The Roumanian armies marched into Hungary. They defeated the Hungarian reds in a real war, and were instrumental in casting out the communists. Then they systematically collected their own reparation, asking no aid and countenancing no interference. They did not strip Hungary as the Hungarians had stripped Roumania. Their collections were made in accordance with lists carefully prepared, and the Bukharest claim is that the exactions were moderate in comparison with the damage that was wrought by the ruthless enemy during the months of Roumania's subjection.

The result is that Roumania, alone of the allies, has extracted substantial payment from her despoilers. Hungary, though humiliated and very angry, is not suffering as a result of Roumania's independent action. On the other hand, Roumania, a nation that was practically ruined by the war, a nation that a year ago was facing bolshevism, starvation, disunion and collapse, is firmly on its feet again, making good progress toward complete rehabilitation and toward the establishment of a powerful barrier state on the threshold of Russia.

VIII.

DANGER IN HUN CLAIM

The problem of Transylvania? At the present time, it has been practically solved. It does not exist, except in the clamors of the Hungarians for new partitions and divisions for the restoration of the plunder on which they have lived for so many centuries.

Transylvania, voluntarily united with the kingdom of Roumania, has taken its proper

place in Roumanian affairs. It is a union based on historical, ethnical, geographical right and justice. Although reconstruction is necessarily a slow process the Roumanians have already made rapid strides toward permanent peace and prosperity. Roumania today stands between the western world and Russia. She is the guardian of the Balkans.

GAME OF WAR.

But ———

And this is the great consideration. Unless the Roumanians are confirmed in their position by the Allies, unless the claims of Hungary for new divisions and partitions in Transylvania are denied, all that has been accomplished in the direction of peace and progress will be lost. For all of Transylvania is necessarily Roumanian. The Hun has no place there. A thousand years have proved there can be no union between these two peoples in Transylvania. A division of Transylvania now would only sow the seed for war and turmoil in the future.

Whether or not the United States joins a League of Nations, whether or not the United States undertakes to help preserve the peace of the world hereafter by force of arms, the people of the United States have now an important interest in a just settlement of the Transylvanian problem. For the claims of Roumania are based on two things for which the Americans fought in the war—the self-determination of small nations and the principles of democracy.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 020 930 540 9